Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

But I submit whether it is not perhaps to be recognized in Hel. 2459 (2457 ff.): *endi he it an thea uuirson hand, / undar fīundo folc fard gekiusid, / an Godes unuuillean endi an gramono hrōm / endi an fiures farm.* It is quite possible, indeed, that *an gramono hrōm* means 'zum Frohlocken der Teufel' (Piper), but in view of such passages as Crist 591 ff., the identification of this *hrōm* and OE. *hrēam* seems to me worth considering. Certainly, the interpretation : 'his lot will be with the fiends ; there is in store for him God's displeasure, wailing of fiends, torment of fire,' is entirely natural.

If this view be accepted, the noun *hrōm* 'cry' (with *ō* from Gmc. *au*) is, of course, to be separated from *hrōm*[11] 'gloria,' 'gloriatio' ('Ruhm'). It should be mentioned that the latter, together with its derivatives, is nearly always spelt in the Cottonian MS. with *uo*, so *hruom* 1562, 5040, 5111, *hruomig* 945, 4926, *hruomian* 5043, 5046, whereas in l. 2459 both MSS. show the *o*,—but, unfortunately enough, the form *hrōm* ('gloria') appears also in C. 1572.

In a number of Ags. dictionaries and glossaries a peculiar uncertainty or confusion is met with concerning the relation between *hrēam* (and the derived verb *hrȳman*) and *hrēman*, *hrēmig* (OS. *hr*(*u*)*omian*, *hr*(*u*)*omig*). There would be no semasiological difficulty in deriving the meaning of 'boast' from that of 'cry.' But, as a matter of fact, the two sets are strictly kept apart both in form and meaning.[12] The verb *hrȳman* (sometimes *hrīman*) 'cry out,' occurs, of course, in the form *hrēman* in Anglian texts (also Cur. Past. 429. 1, see Cosijn, *Altwests. Gram.*, I, § 97 ; Bülbring, § 183, n.), but the *ē* in *hrēman* 'gloriari,' *hrēmig* 'exultans,' 'gloriabundus' is quite stable.[13] The only exception cited in dictionaries is from Brun. 59, where the Parker MS. reads *hramige* with *e* above the line, *i. e.*, as Zupitza remarks, "*e* über getilgtem *a*." Besides, the OS. and OHG. forms with *ō*, *uo* are an inseparable bar to connecting *hrēam*[14] and *hrēman* 'gloriari.' We cannot escape the conclusion that there existed two entirely distinct sets : 1) OE. *hrēam* (OS. *hrōm*, Hel. 2459 ?), ME. *ream*, *rœm*, *rem* (see Stratmann-Bradley) ; OE. *hrȳman* (*hrēman*), ME. *remen*, NE. dial. *ream* (see *Engl. Dial. Dict.*). 2) OS. *hrōm*, *hruom*, OHG. *hruom* (OE. **hrōm* lost) ; OE. *hrēman*, OS. *hrōmian*, *hruomian*, OHG. *hruomian* ; OE. *hrēmig*, OS. *hrōmag*, *hruomig*, OHG. *hruomac*, *ruomig*. It should be added that while OE. *hrēam* occurs in prose and poetry, and *hrȳman* in prose exclusively, OE. *hrēman* and *hrēmig* are never found outside of poetical texts. This might point to a certain archaic flavor of the latter group in OE. and furnish a possible explanation of the early disappearance of the noun *hrōm*.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH LITERATURE ON FLAUBERT BEFORE 1851

Even in Flaubert's youth his writings[1] direct the reader's attention to the two sides of his nature : overflowing romanticism and the power of observation. Both of these are evident in *Novembre* (1842), though, as is to be expected from the date, the second trait is more apparent here than in the other works of the period, until the first *Education sentimentale* (1845). Many influences operated to develop these two characteristics—heredity, surroundings, readings, intimate friendships, personal experiences. These have been examined in detail by M. René Descharmes.[2] It is my purpose to consider only a particular case, which appears to be closely associated with the process by which Flaubert, the violent romantic, became the realist of a later day. This particular case is concerned with his readings in English literature, traces of which abound in the letters and other writings of the period.

---

[11] Very likely Wadstein is right in rendering *hrōm* = *verba* (Aen. XI, 688), Oxf. Verg. Gl. (Wadstein, p. 114) by 'Ruhmredigkeit.'

[12] In *gehþum hrēmig*, Red. d. Seel. 9 (which is perhaps modeled after the well-known *blissum hrēmig*), the sense of 'exultant,' 'elated' seems to have passed into the general meaning of 'moved,' 'agitated.'

[13] The spelling *sigehrœmig* in the Kentish Hymn (Gr.-Wü. II, 226), l. 30, is irrelevant.

[14] On the etymology of *hrēam* see Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautlehre*, p. 68 ; Francis A. Wood, *Color Names*, p. 116.

[1] *Œuvres de Jeunesse inédites*, I, II, III [appendice aux œuvres complètes de Gustave Flaubert]. L. Conard, Paris, 1910. All references are to this edition.

[2] *Flaubert, sa vie, son caractère et ses idées avant 1857.* Paris, 1909.

In 1839 (*Corr.*, I, p. 30) he writes that he is learning English in order to read Shakespeare and Byron. All the evidence, however, indicates that he made use of translations.[3] Be that as it may. he carried out the important part of his purpose : he read Shakespeare and Byron.[4] The letters show that the works of these authors were in his hands, or thoughts of them in his mind, at frequent intervals. Of Shakespeare this is especially true in 1845, 1846 (*Corr.*, I, pp. 170, 171, 187, 250, 257, 269, 459), though he read *Othello* in 1835, at the age of fourteen. Allusions to Byron begin in 1837 and occur oftenest in 1845 when he is on Childe Harold's traces in Switzerland, but it is only in 1847 that we find references which indicate that he is reading specific poems.

The correspondence and the *Œuvres de Jeunesse* together inform us that of specific works by Shakespeare he read *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Timon of Athens*, a play containing Falstaff, *As You Like It* (cp. the parallel of the seven stages of love, *Œ. de J.*, I, p. 521, with the seven ages of man, act II, scene 7), *King Lear* (cf. the scene between the king and his fool, *Loys* XI, *Œ. de J.*, I, pp. 305–311, with several scenes in *Lear; e. g.* act III, scene 6). For Byron the list consists of *Cain*, *Sardanapalus*, *Childe Harold*, *The Giaour*, *Darkness* (cf. the parallelism pointed out by Estève,[5] with a passage from *Mémoires d'un fou*, *Œ. de J.*, I, p. 498), *Manfred*. The letters of 1846, however, indicate consecutive and repeated readings of Shakespeare, and there are allusions—the reference when passing Abydos in 1850, for example—that suggest familiarity with other works of Byron.[6]

The Byronic traces in the youthful literary work of Flaubert have been pointed out by Estève and Descharmes. I should like to add the evident souvenir of Manfred in *Rêve d'Enfer* (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 162.).

There is much of the *Faust* of Goethe here, too, but the conflict between the soul and the demon as outlined in the story of duke Arthur, as well as the description of his appearance and the external setting of the events, suggests stronger kinship with Byron than with Goethe.

The earliest mentions of the two English poets in the letters furnish no indication of the youthful reader's conception of them, except that in 1838 he praises Byron's hostile attitude toward society (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 28), and in 1839 (I, p. 49) he finds more truth in Shakespeare than in history. His conception of Byron, both as man and as poet can, however, be ascertained from the *Œuvres de Jeunesse*. A *Portrait de Byron* (I, p. 25), written before 1836, shows us the man as pictured by his fifteen-year-old reader, and passages from *Mémoires d'un fou* and the *Étude sur Rabelais*, both written in 1838—a year that seems to mark the crisis of the purely romantic, purely personal side of Flaubert—give his view of the poet. The first of these passages is tracing the hero's development :

"Je me nourris donc de cette poésie âpre du Nord, qui retentit si bien comme les vagues de la mer dans les œuvres de Byron. Souvent j'en retenais à la première lecture des fragments entiers et je me les répétais à moi-même, comme une chanson qui vous a charmé et dont la mélodie vous poursuit toujours . . . Ce caractère de passion brûlante, joint à une si profonde ironie devait agir fortement sur une nature ardente et vierge. Tous ces échos inconnus à la somptueuse dignité des littératures classiques avaient pour moi un parfum de nouveauté, un attrait qui m'attirait sans cesse vers cette poésie géante, qui vous donne le vertige et vous fait tomber dans le gouffre de l'infini." (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 496.)

---

[3] "La platitude de la traduction française" (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 496) occurs in a reference to the hero's love for Byron ; a quotation from *Romeo and Juliet* (*ibid.*, p. 241) is in French and suggests by the scene number a different arrangement from the English version; a reference to a Shakespearian passage (*Corr.*, I, p. 170) is either inexact or is based on a much altered text.

[4] Scott is mentioned once in the letters (I, p. 20), Gibbon twice (I, p. 259 ; II, p. 65). From the fondness for the historical tale, evident in Flaubert's choice of subjects in *Œ. de J.*, I, and from his selection of the king's visit to Péronne as the groundwork of *Loys XI* (*Œ. de J.*, I, p. 276), an event that figures largely in *Quentin Durward*, an acquaintance with the Waverly novels is not unlikely. It is uncertain whether he knew Gibbon first hand. One reference—to the final chapter of the History—quotes inexactly the number of years the historian devoted to this task ; the other might be a souvenir of *Childe Harold* (Canto III, st. 107). Sterne is referred to once (*Œ. de J.*, II, p. 147); Robertson once (*Corr.*, I, p. 49).

[5] *Byron et le romantisme français*, p. 282.

[6] One is surprised to find few or no traces of Byron's *Don Juan*. This character is mentioned several times, but merely as a type of the libertine, as is Lovelace. The *Nuit de Don Juan* mentioned by Maupassant in his study of Flaubert (*ed.* Quantin) is now accessible in the appendix to *Œ. de J.*, III. It is a sketch for a tale composed in 1851 (*Corr.*, II, p. 62). Nothing in it suggests the *Don Juan* of Byron.

In the second passage the writer is following the evolution of literary art :

"Ailleurs, dans les sociétés vieillies... quand le doute a gagné tous les cœurs et que toutes les belles choses rêvées . . . sont tombées feuille à feuille . . , que fait le poète? Il se recueille en lui-même ; il a de sublimes élans d'orgueil et des moments de poignant désespoir ; il chante toutes les agonies du cœur et tous les néants de la pensée. Alors, toutes les douleurs qui l'entourent . . . résonnent dans son âme que Dieu a faite vaste, sonore, immense, et en sortent par la voie du génie pour marquer éternellement dans l'histoire la place d'une société, d'une époque, pour écrire ses larmes, pour ciseler la mémoire de ses infortunes—de nos jours c'est Byron." (*Œ. de J.*, II, p. 147.)

The following year (1839) in a mention of Byron, close on the heels of the quotations just given, there is a new note :

"Sais tu, que la jeune génération des écoles est fièrement bête ! autrefois elle avait de l'esprit ; elle s'occupait de femmes, de coups d'épée, d'orgies; maintenant elle se drape sur Byron, rêve de désespoir et se cadenasse le cœur à plaisir. C'est à qui aura le visage le plus pâle et dira le mieux je suis blasé, blasé." (*Corr.*, I, p. 48.)

The change of attitude toward Byron is more marked when in 1845 he contrasts Shakespeare's calm with Byron's sensibility, and a letter of 1846 throws in still clearer relief the fact that his artistic ideals are no longer in sympathy with Byron but lean strongly toward Shakespeare as he sees him :

"Car il y a deux classes de poètes ; les plus grands, les rares, les vrais maîtres résument l'humanité, sans se préoccuper ni d'eux mêmes, ni de leurs propres passions ; mettant au rebut leur personnalité pour s'absorber dans celle des autres, ils reproduisent l'univers qui se reflète dans leurs œuvres . . . ; il y en a d'autres qui n'ont qu'à créer pour être harmonieux, qu'à pleurer pour attendrir et qu'à s'occuper d'eux-mêmes pour rester éternels . . . Byron était de cette famille ; Shakespeare de l'autre, qu'est ce qui me dira en effet ce que Shakespeare a aimé, ce qu'il a trahi, ce qu'il a senti ? C'est un colosse qui épouvante ; on a peine à croire que c'est un homme."

Speaking of types of poetic aspiration, he adds :

"d'autres fois on a la vanité de croire qu'il suffit, comme Montaigne et Byron, de dire ce que l'on pense et ce que l'on sent pour créer de belles choses." (*Corr.*, I, p. 269.)

In chapter XXVII of the *Éducation sentimentale* of 1845 (*Œ. de J.*, III), the whole of which is important for the development of Flaubert's mature theory of art, he himself brings out clearly what his literary conception of the romantic school had been and the process by which the change in it was wrought.

It is the inner history of Jules—that is, of the author himself—after his abortive first love, when with riper judgment he turns to consider the world about him, that is exposed in the following passages :

"Le monde étant devenu pour lui si large à contempler, il vit qu'il n'y avait, quant à l'art, rien en dehors de ses limites, ni réalité ni possibilité d'être. C'est pourquoi le fantastique qui semblait autrefois un si vaste royaume du continent poétique, ne lui en apparut plus que comme une province . . . D'abord il (the supernatural) éclate dans l'Inde . . .; il s'humanise dans la Grèce, passe dans l'art romain . . ., devient terrible au moyen âge, grotesque à la Renaissance et se mêle enfin au vertige de la pensée dans les âmes de Faust et de Manfred . . . Redevenu calme, l'homme ne se comprend plus lui-même : son propre esprit lui fait peur et il s'épouvante de ses rêves, il se demande pourquoi il a créé des djinns, des vampires ; où est-ce qu'il voulait aller sur le dos des griffons, dans quelle fièvre de la chair il a mis des ailes au phallus et dans quelle heure d'angoisse il a rêvé l'enfer . . . Alors il s'éprit d'un immense amour pour ces quelques hommes au-dessus des plus grands, plus forts que les plus forts, chez lesquels l'infini s'est miré comme se mire le ciel dans la mer . . . Ils auraient pu conter leurs douleurs au monde et l'amuser du spectacle de leur cœur ; mais non ! ils accomplissaient leur tâche avec une obstination divine . . . Homère et Shakespeare ont compris dans leur cercle l'humanité et la nature. Tout l'homme ancien est dans le premier, l'homme moderne dans le second . . . Mais ce qui le charmait surtout chez ces pères de l'art c'est la réunion de la passion et de la combinaison ; les poètes les plus exclusifs, les plus personnels ont eu moins de chaleur, de vitalité et même de naïveté dans l'exposition du seul sentiment qui faisait leur grandeur que ceuxlà n'en ont montré dans les sentiments variés qu'ils ont reproduits . . . Il conclut de là que l'inspiration ne doit relever que d'elle seule, que les excitations extérieures trop souvent l'affaiblissent ou la dénaturent—qu'ainsi il faut être à jeun pour chanter la bouteille et nullement en colère pour peindre les fureurs d'Ajax." (*Œ. de J.*, III, pp. 263, 265, 266, 267, *passim.*)

Can a man state more clearly in the form of fiction what have been and what are his theories of literary art? Here while still appreciating their rôle in the evolution of art, he explains why he parted company with the fantastic, the supernatural, the grotesque—of which Manfred is cited as a type—that riots in *Smarh*, in *Rêve d'Enfer*, in *Quidquid Volueris*. Here he reveals the kind of sources to which he turned for inspiration when those of an early day no longer satisfied. Here he declares what trait it was of the men to whom he turned that did satisfy the need of his nature in its evolution. What is still more, he names here the poets in whose works he found that objectivity, that universality which alone now commanded his adherence and his deepest admiration. This is stated very precisely by another passage in this same chapter :

> "Donc il s'adonna à l'étude d'ouvrages offrant des caractères différents du sien, une manière de sentir écarté de la sienne . . . Ce qu'il *aimait* à trouver c'*était* le développement d'une personnalité féconde, l'expansion d'un sentiment puissant . . . *Or* il se dit que cette façon toute subjective, si grandiose parfois, pourrait bien être fausse parce qu'elle est monotone, étroite, parce qu'elle est incomplète, et il rechercha aussitôt la variété des tons, la multiplicité des lignes et des formes, leur différence de détail, leur harmonie d'ensemble." (*Œ. de J.*, III, p. 256.)

How Byron's figure grew dimmer among Flaubert's literary divinities and how Shakespeare came to take a high place in the temple is manifest in these passages, but the reader wonders how it was that even in the author's extreme youth, when Byron and other writers of the type dominated his literary expression, the taste for Shakespeare also manifested itself. Two reasons present themselves. The first is that a great enthusiasm for the drama and for history, manifest from the first writings of the young Flaubert, both in his earliest letters and in various historical tales now accessible in Conard's edition, predisposed him to a fondness for the English dramatist. The other and possibly more important is that at first he read Shakespeare as one of the great romantics. He must have found in *Othello* the passion, the glimpses of strange lands and unfamiliar life, the scenes of horror and death that fascinated him at that period ; *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* were among "les ouvrages les plus brûlants" read by the hero of *Mémoires d'un fou* (1838). Later, when his own nature began to assert itself more vigorously, he found himself hampered, constrained, by the personality of the poet himself ever present in Byron's poetry. Flaubert was by temperament too individual, too self-assertive to endure this. He began to meditate more deeply on the men from whose works he had drawn inspiration ; he began to see in Shakespeare that impassibility, that impersonality which became his own artistic ideal even before the genesis of *Mme. Bovary*. The decline of Byron and the rise of Shakespeare in his esteem do not form of course the whole cause why Flaubert the romantic became Flaubert the realist, but they do act as index fingers in the process, and are thus not without interest.

A. Coleman.

The Johns Hopkins University.

TWO PARALLELS TO GREENE AND LODGE'S *LOOKING-GLASS*

A Looking-Glass for London and England, a play published in 1594 with the names of Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene on its title page, and mentioned by Henslowe in 1591, has occasioned much discussion as to its date of composition and the authorship of particular scenes. In the most recent edition of Greene's plays, that of Professor T. H. Dickinson in the Mermaid Series, the arguments of the late Churton Collins for dating the play as late as 1590 are scouted, but Mr. Dickinson follows the order of plays as given by Collins, placing the *Looking-Glass* before *Orlando Furioso*, which is certainly one of Greene's earliest and crudest dramas. Indeed, Professor Dickinson leans to the opinion expressed by Professor Gay-